

REMARKS

Amendment summary

Claims 2 and 7 are amended for the sake of clarity. In order to more clearly define the variables in formula (2), Applicant has rewritten the formula and defined the appropriate variables in both Claims 2 and 7. In addition, Applicants have amended the claims to remove grammatical errors, and the claims now recite that D may be, among others, a vinylene group, an acetylene group, or a bonding unit shown in the claim. Applicants have also corrected a typographical error and have changed the word “pyroryl” to “pyrrolyl.”

Claim 2 is also amended to remove the term, “D is a divalent group derived from conjugate system” and to recite that when D’ is an arylene group or a heterocyclic divalent group having a substituent represented by formula (2), D’ of formula (2) and D’ of the substituent are different from each other.

No new matter is added by this Amendment, and Applicant respectfully submits that entry of this Amendment is proper.

Preliminary matters

The Examiner requested that the status indicator for Claim 3 be changed to reflect that it has been rejoined. Applicants have changed the status indicator for Claim 3 as appropriate.

Applicants also note that the Examiner suggested changing “bonding unit” in claim 2 to “a bonding unit.” Applicants have made this change.

Status of the claims

Claims 2 and 4-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 2 and 4-9 also have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lo et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0116622) (hereinafter “Lo”). Claim 3 was allowed but for its dependence upon a rejected base claim.

Response to rejection of Claims 2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 4-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite.

The first position set forth in the Office Action is that the claims are allegedly indefinite because of the two definitions of “D.” Applicants note that the claims have been amended to clarify the single definition of “D” and to recite D’ to further distinguish the variables in the claims.

The Office Action also set forth the position that it was unclear if the R³ and b defined in formula (1) were the same as defined in formula (4). Applicants note that the claims have been amended to further clarify the claims in this regard.

Additionally, the Office Action set forth the position that it was unclear to what “pyroryl group” referred. Applicants have amended this word to be “pyrrolyl,” to correct a typographical error.

Response to rejection of Claims 2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2 and 4-9 also have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lo. The Examiner indicated that this rejection would be overcome if the recitation that D is a divalent group derived from a conjugate system were removed from the

claims. Applicants note that the claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and therefore respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Travis B. Ribar /

Travis B. Ribar
Registration No. 61,446

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 27, 2010